tendered for filing a Transmission Service Agreement between MPSI and Rainbow Energy Marketing Corporation (Rainbow).

MPSI states that copies of this filing were served on the Iowa Utilities Board, the South Dakota Public Service Commission, and Rainbow.

MPSI requests the Agreement become effective upon the expiration of the Commission's 60-day notice period, or as soon thereafter as may be practical.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Madison Gas and Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–696–000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, Madison Gas and Electric Company (MGE), tendered for filing a service agreement with Electric Clearinghouse, Inc., under MEG's Power Sales Tariff. MGE requests an effective date 60 days from the date of filing.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Madison Gas and Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–697–000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, Madison Gas and Electric Company (MGE), tendered for filing a service agreement with MidCon Power Services Corporation under MGE's Power Sales Tariff. MGE requests an effective date 60 days from the date of filing.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

7. Madison Gas and Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–698–000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, Madison Gas and Electric Company (MGE), tendered for filing a service agreement with Louis Dreyfus Electric Power, Inc., under MGE's Power Sales Tariff. MGE requests an effective date 60 days from the date of filing.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

8. Madison Gas and Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–699–000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, Madison Gas and Electric Company (MGE), tendered for filing a service agreement with AES Power, Inc., under MGE's Power Sales Tariff. MGE requests an effective date 60 days from the date of filing.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

9. Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

[Docket No. ER95–701–000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC), tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an executed Service Agreement between NMPC and Maine Public Service Company. This Service Agreement specifies that MPSC has signed on to and has agreed to the terms and conditions of NMPC's Power Sales Tariff designated as NMPC's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 2. This Tariff, approved by FERC on April 15, 1994, and which has an effective date of March 13, 1993, will allow NMPC and MPSC to enter into separately scheduled transactions under which NMPC will sell to MPSC capacity and/or energy as the parties may mutually agree.

In its filing letter, NMPC also included a Certificate of Concurrence executed by the Purchaser.

NMPC requests an effective date of February 23, 1995. NMPC has requested waiver of the notice requirements for good cause shown.

NMPC has served copies of the filing upon the New York State Public Service Commission and MPSC.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6744 Filed 3–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[FERC Docket No. CP95–35–000; PRPB Docket No. 94–62–1219–JPU]

EcoEléctrica, L.P.; Notice of Intent to Prepare a Joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Preliminary Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed EcoEléctrica LNG Import Terminal and Cogeneration Project in Guayanilla Bay, Puerto Rico; Request for Comments on Environmental Issues and Notice of Scoping Meetings

March 14, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare a joint environmental impact statement (EIS) with the Puerto Rico Planning Board (PRPB or Board). The document will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of facilities proposed for EcoEléctrica L.P. (EcoEléctrica) Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Import Facility and Cogeneration Project in Guayanilla Bay, Puerto Rico. The FERC and the PRPB will use this joint EIS in their decision-making process (whether or not to authorize the proposed project).[1]

The PRPB will be the lead agency for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the FERC will be the lead Federal agency in the preparation of this joint EIS. The joint document will avoid duplication of environmental analyses, and satisfy the requirements of Puerto Rico's law requiring an EIS under the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (PREQB) Regulations (Article 4[c] of Law No. 9) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Summary of the Proposed Project

EcoEléctrica is seeking approval for a 36-acre site in Guayanilla Bay near Ponce, Puerto Rico, to import LNG for power generation. The facilities that require Commission approval (''jurisdictional'' facilities) include the construction and operation of the LNG facilities. This would consist of a marine unloading facility, two LNG storage tanks with individual capacities of up to 1,000,000 barrels, a vaporization system, and a natural gas accumulator pipeline.

In addition, EcoEléctrica proposes to construct a ''non-jurisdictional'' cogeneration facility that will use the imported LNG as a fuel source for power

[1] EcoEléctrica filed an application with the Commission on October 25, 1994 pursuant to Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act and Parts 153 and 380 of the Commission's regulations. The action involves authorization of a place of import and the construction and operation of facilities at this place of import. On November 23, 1994, the Land Use Consultation was filed with the PRPB pursuant to Law 75 of June 24, 1975.

generation. The power plant facility would consist of two gas turbines operating on natural gas and one steam turbine with a net station output of 461 megawatts (MW) at 230 kilovolts (kV). The gas turbines could also use propane (LPG) as a secondary fuel and high grade fuel oil as an emergency fuel.

The electricity generated by EcoEléctrica's cogeneration facility would be purchased by the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (PREPA), the government-created public utility that supplies nearly all of the electric power consumed in Puerto Rico. PREPA has identified a need for additional electric generating capacity of 1,200 MW by the year 2000 to meet future demand growth, enhance system reliability and to diversify the fuel sources that generate electricity.

EcoEléctrica also proposes to construct a desalination facility that would generate up to 4,000,000 gallons of freshwater per day. Freshwater uses at the power plant could require up to 1,000,000 gallons per day. The surplus capacity would be sold for public use.

Other facilities necessary for the operation of the cogeneration facility include a 2.3-mile long, 230-kV transmission line connecting the plant substation to an existing PREPA substation; a 3.5-mile long, 10-inch diameter pipeline to supply LPG to the facility; and a water pipeline for connecting into an existing offsite water supply or to outside delivery systems.

Summary of the Proposed Facilities

The general location of the proposed facilities for the EcoEléctrica LNG/Cogeneration Project is shown in figure 1. The proposed LNG import terminal, cogeneration power plant, and desalination plant will be located in Peñuelas, about 9 miles west of the City of Ponce on the south coast of Puerto Rico. The proposed 36-acre site is at the end of a peninsula presently owned by Union Carbide Caribe, Inc. (Union Carbide). The site is bordered on the north by Union Carbide's existing fuel storage tank farm operations and on the east, west, and south by Tallaboa and Guayanilla Bays (see figure 2). The site currently contains a decommissioned naptha storage tank and ring foundation for a demolished storage tank.

Major facilities of the proposed project can be divided between LNG import facilities and cogeneration/desalination facilities.

LNG Import Facilities

The LNG import facilities include a ship unloading system, two LNG storage tanks, and LNG vaporization and vapor handling systems. The proposed project facilities would be designed, constructed, and maintained to comply with the Department of Transportation (DOT) Federal Safety Standards for Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities (49 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 193). The facilities constructed at the site would also meet the National Fire Protection Association 59A LNG standards. The marine cargo transfer system and any appurtenances located between the vessel and the last valve located immediately before a storage tank will comply with the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) regulations in 33 CFR Part 127 and Executive Order 10173.

Liquefied natural gas would be imported to Puerto Rico for use in the power plant portion of the project. No firm supply of LNG has been identified at this time. EcoEléctrica is considering potential LNG suppliers from Trinidad and Nigeria. It is anticipated that the project would import up to 130 million MMBtu per year, requiring between 10 and 60 LNG tanker unloadings annually.

The LNG tankers that would be used to transport the LNG would be the 125,000 cubic meter class and would use any of six Coast Guard approved containment systems. Any LNG carrier used for the project would be built in strict accordance with all current regulatory and classification society requirements.

The ship unloading system would consist of unloading facilities and a pier. The unloading facilities are designed to handle LNG ships with a capacity of up to 135,000 cubic meters with a draft of up to 40 feet. Four breasting and mooring dolphins are proposed for securing the LNG ships to the pier's berth. The tanker berth would be roughly parallel to the shore in 50 feet of water. The unloading platform would be a two-level structure with a 40-foot wide by 100-foot long lower level and a 20-foot wide by 76-foot long upper level. The pier is proposed to be 27 feet wide and 1,800 feet long. It would be constructed on 20- to 30-inch diameter steel pipe piles, or prestressed concrete tubes. The pile bents are expected to be constructed on 70-foot spacings. Pier framing, roadway, and spill impoundment system contained within the pier would be constructed of reinforced and prestressed concrete.

On-board pumps would deliver the LNG to the terminal. Four articulated marine unloading arms would be installed on the berth for this purpose. Three of the arms would be used to receive LNG from the ship, and one would return natural gas vapor to the ship. Fire fighting and fire and leak detection systems would be installed on the pier to comply with 33 CFR Part 127. Potential LNG spills from piping at the unloading platform, on the piping pier, and onshore would be impounded in concrete trenches located below the piping. The impoundment trenches would drain to a single impoundment basin located onshore near the end of the pier.

LNG would be stored in two double-containment insulated tanks. The tanks would be 166 feet in height and 254 feet in diameter with an individual capacity to store up to 1,000,000 barrels of LNG each at a temperature of minus 260°F and a pressure of 2.0 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). Each storage tank would consist of an inner tank constructed of 9 percent nickel steel, and an outer tank constructed of carbon steel. Outer walls would be designed to contain the product vapors and protect the insulation systems from moisture. Insulation would consist of perlite installed between the inner and outer tank walls. Each LNG tank would be surrounded by a concrete wall capable of containing 110 percent of the tank's LNG contents. This method of construction would ensure spill containment even if there were a complete rupture of the double walled metal tanks.

LNG from the storage tanks would be pressurized, vaporized, and heated so that natural gas can be delivered to the power plant turbines at the required pressure, temperature, and flow. Pumps in the LNG tanks would transfer and pressurize the LNG to between two and six 95 million cubic feet per day vaporizers. Two shell and tube vaporizers would use a water-ethylene glycol solution heated by the air intakes of the gas turbines. Four open rack vaporizers would use warm seawater to provide the heat required for vaporization. These are two independent systems.

Cogeneration Facilities

The cogeneration facilities can be subdivided into three distinct aspects: power plant facilities, cooling water systems, and desalination facilities. All facilities will meet all applicable Federal and Commonwealth laws. The cogeneration facilities are ''non-jurisdictional'' from the FERC perspective, and will not have any permitting authority for the ''non-jurisdictional'' facilities. The PRPB will have a primary role in assuring that all aspects of the cogeneration facilities meet the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico laws and regulations, including environmental regulations. Since both agencies require a NEPA document, this joint EIS will serve the needs of both agencies.

The power plant would be located on about 11 acres of the 36-acre site (see figure 2). The plant would have a net station output of about 461 MW at 230 kV when operating on natural gas under base load conditions. The plant would consist of two gas combustion turbines operating principally on natural gas and one steam turbine. The turbines could also be operated on LPG as a secondary fuel supply and high grade fuel oil as an emergency source. The LPG would be stored at a nearby location and transported to the facility by a proposed 10-inch diameter pipeline. Fuel oil would be stored on the site in a storage tank.

The power plant facility would consist of a building to house the steam turbine generator, condenser, control room, electrical room, battery room, maintenance area, offices, and other activities. Administrative and storage buildings would also be constructed on the site. These buildings would serve both the LNG import terminal and power plant facilities. A perimeter security system and fire protection/detection system would be monitored both from the administrative building and the power plant control room.

The power plant facility would also include a substation for the transfer of electricity generated by the plant to the PREPA system. The substation would be designed to inter-tie the EcoEléctrica power plant facility to the PREPA circuits. The substation system would also be used to supply power to the LNG facility's electrical equipment.

A cooling water system would be constructed at the facility to provide for power plant cooling and desalinated water production. EcoEléctrica has proposed to use a closed cycle seawater cooling tower (SWCT) system. Other methods of cooling would be analyzed as possible alternatives.

The SWCT system would consist of 10 cells. Each cell would be 50 feet in length and 50 feet in width. The overall site area would encompass 100 feet by 250 feet, with a tower 55 feet high from grade to the top of the fan stack. Water would be obtained from Guayanilla Bay from an intake pipeline placed under the LNG pier. About 13,000 gallons per minute of the SWCT blowdown would be mixed with other treated site water discharge for return to Guayanilla Bay through an offshore diffuser or discharged into Tallaboa Bay via a near-shore outfall structure. Water temperatures of the outfall would not exceed 91.4°F under any operating scenario.

EcoEléctrica has also proposed construction of a desalination plant to provide freshwater for power plant operation and to supply potable water for sale to other users. Freshwater uses at the power plant would include potable water for internal consumption, utility water, and after further treatment, high quality boiler feedwater totaling up to 1,000,000 gallons per day. The maximum freshwater production rate proposed for the desalination plant is expected to be up to 4,000,000 gallons per day. The surplus capacity would be sold for public use.

A Multi-Stage Flash (MSF) distillation technology is proposed to be used for desalination. MSF distillation plants use thermal energy, generally supplied in the form of low pressure steam to desalinate seawater. The combined cycle power plant facility would supply sufficient amounts of steam at suitable temperatures and pressures to drive the desalination process.

Offsite Facilities

Several offsite facilities are associated with the project. These include an electric transmission line, a natural gas accumulator pipeline, an LPG pipeline, a potable water supply line and new access roads (see figure 2 for locations of these facilities).

Electric output from the power plant would be supplied to the PREPA power grid. A 2.3-mile long, 230-kV transmission line would be constructed between the power plant substation and the existing PREPA substation. The line would be constructed on steel structures in a 100-foot wide right-of-way. Existing easements for the transmission corridor would be used whenever possible.

LPG would be used as the primary fuel during the construction of the LNG import facility, and as a backup fuel after the LNG facility is operational. LPG would be supplied to the power plant through a 10-inch diameter pipeline extending about 3.5 miles from the existing ProCaribe LPG terminal to the power plant (see figure 2). The LPG supply line would follow previously permitted pipeline routes and would use existing pipe racks wherever possible.

Normally, a natural gas accumulator vessel would be incorporated into the power plant facility infrastructure. It is used to ensure that natural gas volumes are available to prevent an instantaneous ''emptying'' or ''voiding'' of the supply line during startup of the plant and to prevent over-pressurization of the line after a shutdown. Instead, EcoEléctrica has proposed to use a pipeline ''stub'' rather than a vessel that would be built to the northern edge of the facility along the LPG pipeline right-of-way. This line would serve both as the accumulator line for the power plant and potentially as a feed for future natural gas refueling efforts should these markets develop. EcoEléctrica is not seeking approval for additional sales to sources outside this proposed action.

A water pipeline is also proposed for construction. Surplus freshwater would be marketed to the Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority (PRASA) or to other municipal, commercial, or retain customers. An exact alignment for connection to offsite water supplies or delivery systems outside the easements acquired from the present owner (Union Carbide) has not been obtained. Those easements and environmental documentation would be the responsibility of the PRASA or other users.

Access roads on the Union Carbide property and the proposed site would be developed or upgraded to bring workers and construction materials from route PR–127 and the existing Union Carbide dock (see figure 2). Roads constructed or upgraded would remain active during operation of the facility for materials' deliveries and worker access.

Construction

The LNG import facility and cogeneration facilities at Guayanilla Bay would be constructed by EcoEléctrica using conventional construction procedures and techniques. Two design and construction schedules have been developed: one for the cogeneration facilities and another for the LNG import facilities.

The power plant and desalination facilities would be designed and constructed over a 18 to 24-month period. Site preparation and levee construction would begin six months after the start of basic engineering design. Preparation of the site would require raising the base elevation of the existing site interior (about 5 feet above mean sea level [msl]) to about 10 feet above msl. Increasing the existing perimeter height of the levee from 10 feet to between 12 and 16 feet above msl would also be done. The interior of the site would be filled with imported soils and caliche. The combined levee construction and filling of the site interior would require about 175,000 cubic yards of materials that would be obtained locally from existing sources and transported to the site.

The southeast quadrant of the proposed site would be used for a construction material laydown area and the location of temporary offices. A permanent access road and temporary construction worker parking area would be located north of the laydown area. An existing construction off-loading

dock would be used during construction (see figure 2).

Foundation construction would begin about six months after site preparation activities are begun. Construction of the power plant and desalination facilities would be complete in about one year from the start of foundation construction. Startup of the facility is anticipated two years after the start of basic engineering. Commercial operation would begin after a one-month startup and commissioning period.

The power plant structure would be about 75 feet high and constructed of a steel frame with insulated metal siding and roofing. The structures will be designed following all Federal, Commonwealth, and local building codes.

Construction of the proposed LNG facilities would follow a similar schedule. From basic engineering design to commercial operation would take about 24 to 30 months. Foundation installation on the LNG facility would begin about six months after the start of power plant foundations.

Marine terminal construction would begin four months after the start of foundation construction. The pier would connect the shore facilities with the unloading platform.

LNG tank construction would begin one month after the start of the marine terminal construction. The tanks would be constructed on insulated concrete pads. The tanks would be designed and constructed following all requirements of American Petroleum Institute (API) 620 and 49 CFR Part 193. Completion of all LNG facilities is anticipated about 18 months after initial foundation work. Commercial operation of the LNG facility is expected to start about one year after the start of commercial operation of the cogeneration facilities.

The EIS Process

The NEPA requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from a major Federal action whenever it considers the approval of a place of import for natural gas. The PRPB, as a Commonwealth Agency with authority over location approval and land use control, is required to consider the same potential impacts within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under PREQB regulations under Article 4(c) of Law No. 9. The joint EIS we are preparing will give both the PRPB and the Commission the information we need to do that.

NEPA also requires us to discover and address public concerns about proposals. We call this ''scoping.'' The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the joint EIS on the important environmental issues, and to separate those issues that are insignificant and do not require detailed study. By the Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the joint EIS. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EIS. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The joint EIS will discuss impacts that could occur from the construction and operation of the proposed project. These impacts may include, but are not limited to:

- Geology and Soils

—Seismology and soil liquefaction
—Erosion control
—Right-of-way restoration
—Hazardous waste sites
—Seismic criteria

- Water Resources

—Site-specific impacts on surface and groundwater
—Potential introduction of non-indigenous species and diseases from tanker ballast water
—Effect on potable water supplies
—Effect in wetland hydrology
—Effect on construction in areas with shallow, contaminated groundwater
—Effects of water discharge on marine water quality and ambient temperature

- Biological Resources

—Effect of plant construction and operation on threatened and endangered species
—Effect of increased tanker traffic and marine construction traffic on manatees along the route
—Effects of construction of terminal on marine life in Guayanilla and Tallaboa Bays

- Cultural Resources

—Effect on historic and prehistoric sites
—Effect on underwater cultural resources
—Native American and tribal concerns

- Socioeconomics

—Impact of a peak work force of 400 on surrounding area
—Long-term effects of increased employment and taxes on local economy

- Air Quality and Noise

—Air quality and noise impacts associated with LNG and congeneration facilities during operations
—Air quality and noise impacts associated with construction

- Marine Transportation

—Effects of increased marine traffic on existing commercial and recreational marine traffic
—Probability of increased accident risk and potential for release of LNG or other hazardous materials

- Public Safety

—Compliance with 49 CFR 193 for exclusion zones (thermal and vapor gas dispersion) siting criteria, and seismic criteria
—Consequences of a major spill, both on land and marine
—Cryogenic design and technical review

- Land Use

—Impact on industrial areas
—Effect of rights-of-way and aboveground facilities on visual aesthetics in the region
—Consistency with local land use plans
—Impact on homes

- Cumulative Impacts

—Identification of related projects
—Analysis of cumulative impacts and mitigation measures

We will also evaluate possible site and technology alternatives to the project and recommend specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Federal and Commonwealth agencies are being asked to indicate whether they wish to cooperate with us in the preparation of the joint EIS. These agencies are listed in appendix A and may choose to participate once they have evaluated the proposed project and their agencies' responsibilities.[2]

Our independent analysis of the issues will result in the publication of a Draft/Preliminary EIS (the term Preliminary EIS is a specific milestone in the Puerto Rico environmental documentation procedures). This document will be mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for these proceedings. A 45-day comment period will be allotted for the review of the Draft/Preliminary EIS. We will consider all comments on the Draft/Preliminary EIS and revise the document, as necessary, before issuing a Final EIS. The final EIS will include our response to each comment received.

[2] The appendices and figures referenced in this notice are not being printed in the **Federal Register**. Copies are available from FERC's Public Reference Branch, Room 3104, 941 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426 or call (202) 208–1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

Public Participation and Scoping Meetings

You can make a difference by sending a letter with your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative sites), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letters to:

Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE., Washington, DC 20426

Luis Frías, Secretary, Puerto Rico Planning Board, P.O. Box 41119, Santurce, PR 00940–1119

- Reference Docket No. CP95–35–000 (FERC)
- Reference Docket No. 94–62–1219–JPU (PRPB)
- Send a *copy* of your letter to the following individuals:

Mr. Chris Zerby, FERC EIS Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., NE, Room 7312, Washington, DC 20426

Mrs. María Gordillo, PRPB EIS Project Manager, Puerto Rico Planning Board, P.O. Box 41119, Santurce, Puerto Rico 00940–1119

- Mail your comments so that they are received in Washington, D.C. or Santurce, PR on or before April 17, 1995.

Beside seeking your written comments, we invite you to attend any of the joint public scoping meetings the FERC and the PRPB will conduct. The locations and times for these meetings are listed below. Requests to hold additional public scoping meetings will be considered.

The public meetings will be designed to give you more detailed information and another opportunity to offer your comments on the proposed project. Those wanting to speak at the meetings can call the EIS Project Manager to pre-register their names on the speaker list. Those people on the speaker list before the date of the meeting will be allowed to speak first. A second speaker list will be developed at each meeting. Priority will be given to people representing groups. A transcript of each meeting will be made so that your comments will be accurately recorded. This transcript will be available in both Spanish and English.

Schedule for Joint EIS Public Scoping Meetings

April 18, 1995 (5:00–7:00 pm)

Puerto Rico Planning Board, Minillas Governmental Center, De Diego Avenue, Stop 22, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00940

April 19, 1995 (5:00–7:00 pm)

City Hall, Peñuelas, Puerto Rico

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EIS process, you may want to become an official party to the proceedings or an ''intervenor.'' Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related FERC documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor, you must file a Motion To Intervene according to Rule 214 of FERC's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) which is attached as appendix B.

The date for filing of timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Environmental Mailing List

This notice is being sent to all potential interested parties to solicit focused comments regarding environmental considerations related to the proposed project. As details of the project become established, representatives of EcoElectrica will directly contact communities, and public agencies concerning any other matters, including acquisition of permits and rights-of-way.

If you do not want to send comments at this time but still want to keep informed and receive copies of the Draft/Preliminary and Final EIS, please return the Information Request (appendix C). If you do not return the Information Request, you will be taken off the mailing list.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Mr. Chris Zerby, FERC Project Manager, at (202) 208–0111. Information concerning the involvement of the Puerto Rico Planning Board can be obtained from Mrs. Maria Gordillo, PRPB Project Manager, at (809) 727–4444.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6702 Filed 3–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 8835–019 California]

Dewey B. Smith; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

March 14, 1995.

An environmental assessment (EA) is available for public review. The EA is for the termination of the license of the Dewey Smith Hydroelectric Project. The EA finds that termination of the license would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The Dewey Smith Project is located on the Shasta River in Siskiyou County, California.

The EA was prepared by staff in the Office of Hydropower Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Copies of the EA can be viewed at the Commission's Reference and Information Center, Room 3308, 941 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Copies can also be obtained by calling the project manager listed below.

Please submit any comments within 45 days from the date of this notice. Any comments, conclusions, or recommendations that draw upon studies, reports or other working papers of substance should be supported by appropriate documentation.

Comments should be addressed to Lois D. Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Please denote ''Comments: Project No. 8835–019'' on all comments. For more information, please contact the project manager, John Mudre, at (202) 219–1208.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6700 Filed 3–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP95–217–000, et al.]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

March 10, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission: